DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 10, 13-14, 22, and 28 Pending.

Claims 1-9, 11-12, 15-21, and 23-27 Canceled.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 9/2/2008 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

After further review of the prior art and Applicants argument following the

interview held on 8/26/2008 in which Examiner agreed to reconsider the rejection

in view of Applicants arguments, Examiner has concluded that the rejection

made by the previous examiner was not in error and the art of Chatterjee in view

of Dobrowski does disclose the limitations found in the instant claims.

After review of the art of Chatterjee, Examiner has concluded that the URL

which is identified during the scan of the webpage and the metadata embedded

in the annotated object may, in combination, act as the set of parameters

identifying the annotated data object. From Chatterjee, Column 5, Lines 8-35:

> In addition to the URL, the markup tag which identifies multimedia may include additional
> information which describes how the media content is integrated into the web page. For
> example, "<img>" tags may also include optional parameters such as an "alt" parameter
> which specifies descriptive text to be displayed when, for some reason, the referenced
> image file cannot be rendered, and "height" and "width" parameters indicating the size of
> the image as displayed in the Web page. This descriptive information may be extracted
> to form part of the metadata about the referenced multimedia data which is later inserted
> into the Web page for indexing and searching as discussed later.
>
> Still further information may be obtained from the file system directories which are
> maintained by the storage system which stores the multimedia data. Such directories

typically contain time stamp information indicating when media data files were initially created and last modified.

This information may be captured from the system directories and included as part of the metadata describing the multimedia data. Finally, the content of the media data itself may contain information which can be expressed in text form as metadata. To capture such information, the type and format of the media data may be determined as indicated at 38 in FIG. 2 from the MIME type designation or a registered type designation Associated with the filename extension in the URL, or by identifying format-identifying characteristics of the media data.

As can be seen from the citation, multiple locations (e.g. the URL contained in the link data, as well as the actual disk location of the object) may be identified. Examiner notes that the three sources of information (URL link, object annotations, and system directories) act together to describe the annotated object. Furthermore, as is disclosed in the previously cited sections of Chatterjee, the type of the object is determined from the 'parameters' which are received, and as can be seen by Figures 1 and 2, different items of information (e.g. identifying parameters) are pulled from the object, URL, and system directories to be included in the information to be indexed based on the object type. As it is known that the object is going to be indexed by a search engine, the differing items of information that are pulled to be included in the search engine index comprises the mapping (e.g. for each data type, different features are 'mapped' to the search engine index).

As per Applicants arguments regarding the art of Dobrowski, Examiner notes that Dobrowski, Column 8, Lines 60-65 supports the cited sections and clearly indicate that a variety of types of data may be mapped to a parameter in an index (e.g. a column of an index), which indicated that a single column of the

index may contain various types of data (e.g. identifying parameters). Examiner

notes that this does note indicate intent on the part of Dobrowski to group all

information about an object into a single column of the database, but rather

allows for the option of grouping related information of different types into a

single column of the database.

In light of the above arguments, the rejection of Claims 10, 13-14, 22 and

28 will be maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

4.   Claims 10, 13-14, 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Chatterjee et al. (US 7,162,691 B1) in view of Dobrowski et

al. (US 7,152,072 B2).

As per claim 10 Chatterjee et al. is directed to a computer implemented

method of managing annotations for a plurality of different type data objects,

comprising: receiving a set of parameters identifying an annotated data object,

wherein the identifying parameters identify locations of the annotated data object

(Chatterjee et al., column 1, lines 42-47); selecting, based on the set of

identifying parameters, a mapping from a plurality of mappings, each containing

a different set of mapping functions (Chatterjee et al., column 5, lines 30-35); and

creating an index for the annotated data object by mapping the identifying

parameters to columns in an index table, as specified by the mapping functions

of the selected mapping, (Chatterjee et al., column 1, lines 38-40; column 6, lines

44-51).

Chatterjee et al. does not explicitly teach wherein the mapping functions

for each mapping are designed to map a different set of identifying parameters to

columns in the index table.

Chatterjee et al. does teach mappings depending on media type

association (Chatterjee et al., column 1, lines 42-46; column 3, lines 48-50)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to mappings depending on media type association because

Chatterjee et al. teaches different media types wherein different media-types

could contain different amount and type of parameters (Chatterjee et al., column

4, lines 56- 62).

Chatterjee et al. does not teach wherein the mapping functions of at least

one of the mappings maps more than one identifying parameter to a single

column.

Dobrowski et al. does teach wherein the mapping functions of at least one

of the mappings maps more than one identifying parameter to a single column

(.Dobrowski et al.; figure 4, column 8, lines 44-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to combine Chatterjee et al. by teachings of Dobrowski et al.
to include wherein the mapping functions of at least one of the mappings maps
more than one identifying parameter to a single column because entering
parameters into one column clusters information about the object in efficient
manner.

As per claim 13 Chatterjee et al. as modified is directed to wherein the
more than one identifying parameters are mapped to different sets of bytes in the
single column (Dobrowski et al.; figure 4, wherein each line is different sets of
bytes).

As per claim 14 Chatterjee et al. as modified is directed to at least one of
the mappings comprises mapping functions for mapping parameters identifying
annotated data objects associated with a database to the index table columns
(column 1, lines 38- 40), at least one of the mappings comprises mapping
functions for mapping parameters identifying annotated data objects associated
with a text document to the index table columns (column 1, lines 41-50).

As per claim 22 Chatterjee et al. as modified still is directed to wherein at
least one of the mappings comprises mapping functions for mapping parameters
identifying data objects associated with a text document to the index table
columns (column 1, lines 41-50).

As per claim 28 Chatterjee et al. is directed to a computer implemented method of managing annotations for a plurality of different type data objects, comprising: receiving a set of parameters identifying an annotated data object, wherein the identifying parameters identify locations of the annotated data object (Chatterjee et al., column 1, lines 42-47);selecting, based on the set of identifying parameters, a mapping from a plurality of mappings, each containing a different set of mapping functions, wherein at least one of the mappings comprises mapping functions for mapping parameters identifying annotated data objects associated with a database to the index table columns, and at least one of the mappings comprises mapping functions for mapping parameters identifying annotated data objects associated with a text document to the index table columns (Chatterjee et al., column 5, lines 30-35); and creating an index for the annotated data object by mapping the identifying parameters to columns in an index table, as specified by the mapping functions of the selected mapping (Chatterjee et al., column 1, lines 38-40; column 6, lines 44-51).

Chatterjee et al. does not explicitly teach wherein the mapping functions for each mapping are designed to map a different set of identifying parameters to columns in the index table.

Chatterjee et al. does teach mappings depending on media type association (Chatterjee et al., column 1, lines 42-46; column 3, lines 48-50)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mappings depending on media type association because

Chatterjee et al. teaches different media types wherein different media-types could contain different amount and type of parameters (Chatterjee et al., column 4, lines 56- 62).

Chatterjee et al. does not teach wherein the mapping functions of at least one of the mappings maps more than one identifying parameter to a single column.

Dobrowski et al. does teach wherein the mapping functions of at least one of the mappings maps more than one identifying parameter to a single column (Dobrowski et al.; figure 4, column 8, lines 44-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Chatterjee et al. by teachings of Dobrowski et al. to include wherein the mapping functions of at least one of the mappings maps more than one identifying parameter to a single column because entering parameters into one column clusters information about the object in efficient manner.

5.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Hicks whose telephone number is

(571) 272-2670. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday

9:00a - 5:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on (571) 272-4190. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael J Hicks
Art Unit 2165
Phone: (571) 272-2670
Fax: (571) 273-2670

/Christian P. Chace/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165